

---

**ANNALS OF THE POLISH ASSOCIATION  
OF AGRICULTURAL AND AGRIBUSINESS ECONOMISTS**

ROCZNIKI NAUKOWE  
STOWARZYSZENIA EKONOMISTÓW ROLNICTWA I AGROBIZNESU

---

Received: 31.12.2022

Acceptance: 12.02.2023

Published: 22.03.2023

JEL codes: R11, O18, O31

Annals PAAAE • 2023 • Vol. XXV • No. (1)

License: Attribution 3.0 Unported (CC BY 3.0)

DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0016.2287

**MAGDALENA ANNA ZWOLIŃSKA-LIGAJ<sup>1</sup>, DANUTA JOLANTA GUZAL-DEC**

John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Biala Podlaska, Poland

**COOPERATIVE LINKS BETWEEN BUSINESSES  
IN THE CONTEXT OF LOCAL SYSTEM RESILIENCE.  
A CASE STUDY OF POLAND'S PERIPHERAL REGIONS**

Key words: local resilience, smart village, innovativeness, entrepreneurship,  
peripheral region

**ABSTRACT.** This study investigates the extent and nature of cooperative links between businesses in the analysed administrative units (communes) in peripheral regions in terms of their effect on strengthening the resilience of local economy. Empirical research was carried out in 2018 in three peripheral regions of Poland on a sample of 240 entrepreneurs. Entrepreneurs participated in creating local (commune-level) supply chains while reporting connections with suppliers outside of local systems. Businesses analysed in this study played a key role in enhancing the diversity of local (commune-level) goods and services markets while time taking into account their customers' requirements. Local cooperation promoted strengthening of the competitive edge of cooperating businesses, becoming a local resilience factor. The characteristics of cooperative links presented in the study revealed that the benefits of local cooperation were appreciated more often in the group of businesses with inferior conditions for running and growing a business. Local economic growth policies in peripheral regions should take into account the assumptions arising from the smart village concept. A vital component of these policies in the context of fostering local innovativeness is the focus on the possibility of stimulating cooperation processes within local business sectors. Such focus of local policies may be seen as aimed at enhancing the resilience of local socio-economic systems.

---

<sup>1</sup> Corresponding author: [m.zwolinska-ligaj@dyd.akademiabialska.pl](mailto:m.zwolinska-ligaj@dyd.akademiabialska.pl)

## INTRODUCTION

The pursuit of the development of local systems in peripheral regions entails following a policy of sustainable growth wherein broadly defined innovations play a leading role. The concept of *smart village* is one of the ways in which sustainable growth of rural areas can be achieved and innovativeness in those areas can be improved. It offers a prospective approach to increasing the innovation potential of rural areas in peripheral regions. Smart development of the countryside requires e.g. the implementation of technical and technological innovations, structural changes and economic transformations based on the local potential of villages, strengthening social innovation and developing local innovation systems [Adamowicz 2021, Guzal-Dec 2018, Zwolińska-Ligaj 2018, 2021]. In this context, the need to boost innovativeness, develop connections between local systems and their environment and looking for new development paths perform a crucial function. A method of stimulating innovation in local economies is to enhance the status and scope of cooperative links between businesses.

Recently, the *smart village* concept has generated interest in the light of its perceived contribution to boosting resilience of territorial units [e.g. Stojanova et al. 2021, Pérez-delHoyo, Mora 2019, Slee 2019]. Business growth which leads to multi-functional and smart development is also a growth that improves the resilience of local economies.

The notion of resilience has attracted increasing attention – among academics and policymakers alike. This interest results from the perceived need to improve the adaptability of various types of systems in response to disruption, unexpected change and uncertainty, all of which currently characterize their environment [Martin et al. 2021]. Resilience is discussed in various contexts both as a feature of an object, entity or system and, in the normative approach, as a desirable characteristic which should be supported [Martin, Sunley 2015].

Resilience is defined as “bounce back” (recovery) from a shock, the “ability to absorb shocks”, positive adaptability to shock absorption or “positive adaptability in anticipation of or in response to shocks” [Martin, Sunley 2015] (Table 1). This characteristic is present in different dimensions/scales which interact with one another [Fielke et al. 2017].

Economic sciences provide definitions of local or regional resilience, which means the ability of a given economy to survive or overcome market, competitive or environmental shocks along its development path by making adaptive changes in its economic structures and social and institutional solutions, as required, so as to maintain or reinstate the previous development path or to transition to a new, sustainable path with a more productive and fair use of physical, human and environmental resources [Martin et al. 2021 by: Martin, Sunley 2020, p. 75]. The resilience of regional and local economies is an important subject of academic inquiry because of its practical implications for policymaking in these areas [Martin, Sunley 2015, Fielke et al. 2017].

The subject of local system resilience is embedded in the territorially oriented regional policy, which has its origins in the economic region theory, endogenous growth theory and institutional orientation [cf. Churski 2018]. The legacy of the endogenous growth theory points researchers in directions such as social capital, relational capital, knowledge resources [Camagni, Capello 2013], as well as leadership, institutions, creativity, innovation and entrepreneurship [Stimson et al. 2011], all of which form a spectrum of possible contexts for discussing resilience. Studies on territorial growth in the institutional economy trend make use of such concepts as embeddedness or the economics of proximity [Sokołowicz 2015], discussed in the context of the resilience of socio-economic systems [e.g. Young 2010, Steiner, Atterton 2015, Vlasov et al. 2018]. Other concepts which enable research on resilience include the entrepreneurial ecosystem concept [Iacobucci, Perugini 2021, Roundy et al. 2017].

The resilience of a socio-economic system is determined by the dynamics of four interacting subsystems: the structural and business subsystem, the labour market subsystem, the financial subsystem and the governance subsystem [Martin, Sunley 2015]. Of key significance is the structural and business subsystem (of a region, city or town). Locations with a varied economy are considered more socio-economically resilient than those with a narrow economic base; they are also argued to offer greater scope for a re-orientation of the economy. Moreover, the resilience of an economy is greater if individual industries are not strictly locally interdependent [Martin, Sunley 2015]. Among resilience determinants are also such characteristics of businesses as size and ownership, reliability of local supply chains, scope for switching to alternative (cheaper or more stable) suppliers or the business culture of the area [Martin, Sunley 2015].

Resilience offers an interesting perspective for evolutionary studies on growth trajectories and making new development policies in rural areas, focused on mobilising both local and non-local resources, based on adaptive cooperation networks and allowing for the reduction of the environmental footprint of the rural lifestyle and patterns of consumption [Scott 2013].

In reference to rural areas, socio-economic diversity is associated with the progress of multi-functional and sustainable growth processes in these areas. Progressing diversification and increasing diversity may refer to the diversity of agricultural activities in the rural area, diversification of farmers' non-agricultural activities, as well as to the diversification of economic activity in the rural area, where agriculture is perceived as one of many possible business activities [Quaranta, Salvia 2014, cf. Adamowicz, Zwolińska-Ligaj 2009]. In those transformations, which broaden the range of economic and social functions in rural areas, communities, entrepreneurs and small and medium businesses play a crucial role [Terluin 2003, Steiner, Atterton 2015, Zwolińska-Ligaj 2007, 2015].

Local resilience is supported by entrepreneurship processes, buoyant local economy of diversified structure and employment opportunities [Steiner, Atterton, 2015, Lapuh 2018].

The key ways in which businesses impact resilience include [Steiner, Atterton 2015]:

- 1) creating new jobs which are diversified as to the type of employment;
- 2) widening the choice of local products and services offered by local markets;
- 3) cooperation with local and regional businesses, including mutual promotion and support, trade and information exchange;
- 4) adding value to business activity in the form of improved living conditions and employment opportunities, which encourage young population to remain in the area.

Literature emphasises the role of diverse networks in the development of rural areas [Murdoch 2000, Atterton 2007, Young 2010]. According to Jan D. van der Ploeg and Terry Marsden [2008], the paths along which rural areas develop are determined by the concentration and quality of internal and external interaction networks. The growth of local supply chains and the inclusion of new businesses in the supply chains are conducive to innovations and competitiveness as well as fostering the relations between manufacturers and consumers [King et al. 2015]. On a local level, the development of networks should nevertheless be accompanied by connections on a national and international level for the avoidance of being stuck on the growth path [Nauwelaers, Wintjes 2002, Lapuh 2018].

In terms of local cooperation, business embeddedness is a principal factor in the resilience and growth of rural areas. For non-locally focused companies, this embeddedness may be oriented on intra-industrial relations. It may also take the form of a broad local embeddedness as part of intra- and cross-industrial cooperation between companies which are focused on the local market and which benefit from such a situation [Young 2010].

It appears that the more traditional the business (small and independent, with low labour productivity, managed by a local owner), the more its geographic range of sales and purchase reveals its local character [Courtney et al. 2005, Steiner, Atterton 2015]. The company's peripheral location is another determinant of the local character of its markets [Steiner, Atterton 2015].

Basic types of cooperation in an industry include the exchange of considerations and combining resources and activities for the joint performance of internal and external business functions [Lichtarski 2003]. Networks are categorised based on how closely the interconnected entities interact with one another. Jan Lichtarski [2003] makes a distinction between:

- 1) non-contractual networks (wherein the supplier and the buyer cease to be anonymous, with the supplier adjusting its offer to the needs and requirements of the buyer);
- 2) contractual (wherein the subject of cooperation becomes the subject of the contract);
- 3) coordination networks (established in order to perform joint operations of coordination and decision centres, albeit with limited freedom);
- 4) networks with a single decision centre;
- 5) organisations in which entities cease to be legally separate.

This study investigates the extent and nature of cooperative links between businesses in the analysed administrative units (communes) in peripheral regions in terms of their effect on strengthening the resilience of local economy.

## MATERIAL AND METHODS

Empirical research was carried out in three regions of Poland: Lubelskie, Podkarpackie and Warmińsko-Mazurskie, which are located on the border and characterized by a relatively lower potential in terms of socio-economic conditions. In each region, 10 communes were selected for analysis<sup>2</sup>. This study took account of the communes' Smart Growth Potential (SGR) defined on the basis of a tool concept developed with other authors [Zwolińska-Ligaj et al. 2018] for the diagnosis of the following six indicators: governance, quality of life, economy, society, natural environment and mobility. Five communes were randomly picked from each category with extreme (very low and very high) SGR values. In each of the 30 communes, based on the REGON statistical register, 8 businesses with the highest number of employees were selected, assuming that entities with relatively higher economic potential have greater scope for influencing local innovation processes, also through contributions to the growth of local cooperation. The study made use of a survey carried out by means of an interview questionnaire. The research was performed from July to November 2018. The material included a total of 240 interview questionnaires<sup>3</sup>.

Results were presented by means of a descriptive analysis with the use of quantitative and qualitative methods including comparative analysis in the system of communes representative of a class of relatively very high and very low values of the synthetic SGR indicator as well as the territorial system in the commune, district, and beyond-district category. Calculations were performed in Statistica 13.3 software.

---

<sup>2</sup> Lubelskie Province: Janów Lubelski, Parczew, Milejów, Poniatowa, Jastków (communes with very high smart growth potential), Nielisz, Stary Brus, Abramów, Dzwola, Leśniowice (communes with very low smart growth potential), Podkarpackie Province: Trzebownisko, Mielec, Świlcza (communes with very high smart growth potential), Nisko, Ustrzyki Dolne (communes with high smart growth potential), Krzywca, Wielkie Oczy, Domaradz, Dynów, Nozdrzec (communes with very low smart growth potential), Warmińsko-Mazurskie Province: Stawiguda (commune with very high smart growth potential), Tolkmicko, Mikołajki, Węgorzewo, Orneta (communes with high smart growth potential), Szczytno, Sępopol, Sorkwity, Kozłowo, Świętajno (communes with very low smart growth potential).

<sup>3</sup> The study was part of project WNET/KEZ/ZE/1 "Innovation, innovativeness and regional/local growth", financed from the funds allocated for the statutory activities of the Faculty of Business and Engineering of the University of Applied Sciences in Białą Podlaska. The publication was financed by the project "Resilience of urban-rural communes in Poland. Operationalization, measurement, diagnosis of adaptive mechanisms" from the Science Development Fund.

## RESULTS

### CHARACTERISTICS OF BUSINESSES

The analysed sample consisted mostly of businesses from sectors such as industrial processing (43.3%), wholesale and retail (15.0%) and construction (10.8%). Micro-enterprises accounted for over half of the sample (63.8%)<sup>4</sup>. The vast majority of the businesses analysed in this study described their activities as labour-intensive (87.5%). The remaining ones categorised their activities as either knowledge-intensive (9.6%) or capital-intensive (2.9%). The study revealed low innovativeness of the businesses. Only 3.8% of entities included in the sample reported some efforts made to implement innovations in 2016-2018 [Zwolińska-Ligaj 2018].

In the period relevant to this study, the businesses were in a generally good financial and economic condition. Over half of entrepreneurs (52.9%) rated their situation as very good or good, while 40.4% of those gave average ratings. Notably, businesses based in communes belonging to the group with a relatively high SGR assessed their financial and economic situation as much better than those in the group of communes with low SGR values (respectively 66.8% and 40% surveyed businesses rated their situation as very good and good). Ratings were consistent with the opinions with regard to the future of the businesses over the next three years after the study. Nearly 1/3 of the surveyed (29.6%) declared their intention to develop their business, 59.6% to maintain their current market position, whereas only 10.8% stated that they were going to reduce their size or scope. The intention to grow the business was stated much more often (in 38.3% cases) by entrepreneurs from communes with a high SGR – in comparison with 20.8% in the group of entrepreneurs from communes with a low SGR.

### STATUS OF COOPERATIVE LINKS BETWEEN BUSINESSES

Looking at the potential for cooperation between businesses from the same industry or related industries, one may notice that the substantial majority of entrepreneurs confirmed that their direct competitors are based in the same commune (76.3% of the surveyed) or district (81.7% of the surveyed). In communes categorised as belonging to the low-SGR group, the presence of direct competitors was reported more frequently than in the group of high-SGR communes: respectively, 81.7% and 70.8%. The presence of competitors in the district area was perceived by 87.5% entrepreneurs from communes with a low SGR and 75.8% entrepreneurs from communes with a high SGR.

<sup>4</sup> Taking into account the criteria for selecting enterprises, the high share of microenterprises in the sample should be associated with the structure of national economy entities located in rural areas by size, in which entities with a declared number of employees of up to 9 persons in 2018 accounted for 96.5% [GUS 2020, p. 114].

Table 1. Nature of relations between a business and its competitors in the commune, district and beyond the district area

Type of interactions	Commune (N = 183)		District (N = 196)		Beyond district (N = 240)	
	amount	%	amount	%	amount	%
Weak and occasional interactions concerning social matters and exchange of information	77	42.1	74	37.8	83	34.6
Many frequent interactions concerning economic, social matters and exchange of information	62	33.9	51	26.0	42	17.5
Simultaneous competition and cooperation of economic and non-economic nature	29	15.8	25	12.8	18	7.5

Note: numbers of N refer to entrepreneurs who have confirmed the presence of competitors in a given area; selected types of relations were examined; respondents could choose more than one answer

Source: own research

When describing interactions between the entrepreneurs analysed in the present study and their potential competitors, we should emphasize their mainly local character (in geographical terms, restricted to the same commune) and less intensive forms of cooperation including occasional interactions in areas such as social matters or exchange of information. A third of the entrepreneurs surveyed in this study reported that in the commune frequent and multiple relations maintained by their enterprise concern socio-economic matters and exchange of information. The most advanced form of interaction, i.e. one involving simultaneous competition and cooperation, was reported by only 15.8% of the respondents. Supra-local relations were less common and less intensive (Table 1).

More advanced forms of interaction with competitors were characteristic of entities based in communes with relatively better SGR scores, both for interactions with other businesses in the same commune and those from a different district. On a commune level, in the group of entrepreneurs who described their interactions as many and frequent in areas such socio-economic matters and information exchange as well as relations categorized as cooptation, there were respectively 63% and 62.1%. entrepreneurs from communes with a high SGR. Businesses from communes with a high SGR accounted for 61.1% of the respondents who confirmed simultaneous competition and cooperation with enterprises from outside the district. For supra-local intensive relations concerning social and economic matters as well as information exchange, there was no difference between groups of communes juxtaposed in the study (17.5% each).



A local economy which is diverse in terms of industrial structure and which provides scope for cooperation with suppliers and contributing to a wider choice of local goods and services targeting individual buyers promotes resilience and offers solid foundations for creating growth processes. A significant majority of entrepreneurs confirmed that their current or potential suppliers are located in the same commune or district (respectively 88.8% and 89.6%). Local availability of suppliers was reported by entrepreneurs representing low-SGR communes; according to 90.8% respondents, their suppliers were based in their commune, according to 94.2% respondents – in their district. For communes with high SGR levels, the corresponding scores were 86.7% and 85%.

Like interactions with competitors, relations with suppliers appeared to be linked to the geographic proximity of businesses. More intensive relations were developed with local entities, based in the same commune and district. More than half of respondents stated that their counterparties were not anonymous, transactions were regular, and the subject of these transaction was adapted to the buyer's requirements. Of note is also the fact that a considerable proportion of respondents (45.1%) on a commune level admitted to pursuing only low-risk joint undertakings with their suppliers. A smaller group of respondents confirmed the existence of trust between cooperating businesses, exchange of information and making joint efforts, which can be regarded as another step in forming cooperative bonds that may bring mutual benefits, e.g. innovations. Entrepreneurs rarely reported that cooperation with suppliers took an official (contractual) form. Cooperation with respondents and their suppliers outside the district was much less advanced (Table 2).

Table 2. Nature of interactions between a business and its suppliers in the commune, district and beyond the district area

Type of interactions	Commune (N = 213)		District (N = 215)		Beyond district (N = 240)	
	amount	%	amount	%	amount	%
Parties are not anonymous, transactions are regular, offering is adapted to the buyer's requirements	127	59.6	121	56.3	115	47.9
Initial low-risk joint undertakings with suppliers	96	45.1	87	40.5	85	35.4
Shared benefits, trust in partner businesses, more information exchanged and joint efforts	39	18.3	41	19.1	27	11.3
Cooperation formalised by means of a contract	31	14.6	29	13.5	17	7.1

Note: numbers of N refer to entrepreneurs who have confirmed the presence of suppliers in a given area; selected types of relations were examined; respondents could choose more than one answer

Source: own research



As in the case of interactions with competitors, more advanced forms of cooperation with suppliers, both on a commune and district level, were characteristic of businesses from high-SGR communes. For reported cooperation with suppliers on a commune level, this type of administrative unit was represented by over 50% entrepreneurs. Achieving shared benefits, trust in partner businesses, more information exchanged and making joint efforts, as well as formalisation of relationships through contracts were reported for respectively 54% and 55% enterprises from communes with a high SGR. Beyond the district level, shared benefits were cited by respectively 63% and 47% respondents.

Variety of goods and services offered on the local market is another area of significance to local resilience analysis. Nearly all businesses contributed to the development of the offering of locally available goods and services, with buyers located in the same commune: 99.2% for high-SGR and 97.5% for low-SGR communes. In the group of communes with high SGR, 79.2% surveyed confirmed that buyers were located in the same district. The corresponding score for low-SGR communes was 95%.

According to respondents, an overwhelming majority of entrepreneurs represent the individual approach, with regular transactions and offer customized to the needs of the buyer. This approach is particularly noticeable for transactions with local buyers from the same commune, and, more broadly, the same district. More advanced forms of cooperation with buyers were reported less often than those with suppliers. They included: fostering cooperation based on mutual trust and exchange of information to enable joint activities (Table 3).

Table 3. The nature of interactions between a business and buyers in the commune, district and beyond the district area

Type of interactions	Commune (N = 236)		District (N = 209)		Beyond district (N = 240)	
	amount	%	amount	%	amount	%
Interactions concern only actual transactions, no individual approach in transactions	59	25.0	71	34.0	71	29.6
Parties are not anonymous, transactions are regular, offering is adapted to the buyer's requirements	171	72.5	157	75.1	153	63.8
Initial low-risk joint undertakings	88	37.3	80	38.3	68	28.3
Shared benefits, trust in partner businesses, more information exchanged and joint efforts	26	11.0	28	13.4	21	8.8
Cooperation formalised by means of a contract	33	14.0	27	12.9	15	6.3

Note: numbers of N refer to entrepreneurs who have confirmed the presence of buyers in a given area; selected types of relations were examined; respondents could choose more than one answer  
Source: own research

More intensive and advanced forms cooperation with buyers, both local and supra-local, were associated with most visible relationship to SGR. Among entrepreneurs who declared cooperation on a commune level, shared benefits, trust in partner businesses, more information exchanged and joint efforts, as well as formalisation of relationships through contracts, respectively 69.2% and 81.2% enterprises represented communes with a high SGR. As regards cooperation above district level, the values were respectively 71.4% and 80.0%.

Entrepreneurs perceived diverse benefits associated with enlisting several types of cooperation on a local level. Among the surveyed, 37.1% (89 entrepreneurs) declared

Table 4. Benefits derived by businesses from local cooperation by commune type defined according to the smart growth potential level criterion (N = 89)

Benefits	Smart growth potential				Total	
	high		low			
	amount	%	amount	%	amount	%
Decreased operational risk	59	66.3	30	33.7	89	100.0
Shorter undertaking completion times	56	62.9	31	34.8	87	97.8
Increased customer satisfaction	52	58.4	33	37.1	85	95.5
Greater flexibility of operations	40	44.9	28	31.5	68	76.4
Creating the desired company image among entities forming local economy	39	43.8	27	30.3	66	74.2
Improved effectiveness, competitiveness	40	44.9	25	28.1	65	73.0
Shaping customer loyalty towards the brand and the company	37	41.6	27	30.3	64	71.9
Implementing innovation	43	48.3	16	18.0	59	66.3
Streamlined management	43	48.3	15	16.9	58	65.2
Ensuring professional performance of certain activities	31	34.8	22	24.7	53	59.6
Cheaper supply sources	28	31.5	17	19.1	45	50.6
Cost reduction, economies of scale	28	31.5	14	15.7	42	47.2
Obtaining unavailable resources	27	30.3	12	13.5	39	43.8

Note: respondents could indicate more than one answer

Source: own research

deriving benefits from their cooperation with local entrepreneurs. The benefits were more often perceived by entrepreneurs located in communes with a low SGR (39.2%) compared to businesses based in communes with a high SGR (35.0%).

Among the key profits gained from local cooperation, the respondents cited decreased operational risk, shorter undertaking completion times and increased customer satisfaction (Table 4).

Entrepreneurs from high-SGR communes saw many more advantages of local cooperation than entrepreneurs from low-SGR communes. Benefits which came to the fore in this group included decreased operational risk, streamlined management, implementing innovations and shorter completion time for an undertaking.

## CONCLUSIONS

In the light of theoretical discussion and results of empirical research in this study, we may formulate the following conclusions:

1. Businesses analysed in the present study were in fairly good financial and economic condition and were mainly involved in labour-intensive economic activities. At the same time, they were characterized by very limited activity in terms of innovation. Only a third of them were development oriented. Of note is the significant role of the businesses in shaping local labour markets as well as their limited ability to compete on the strength of implemented innovations (during the period analysed in this study), a characteristic which could enable them to exert greater impact on boosting the local economy. Another important finding concerns conclusions for entrepreneurs implementing innovations in peripheral regions, who take advantage of services outside of local systems more frequently [Shearmur, Doloreux 2022].
2. Relatively more favourable SGR conditions co-existed with more intensive forms of cooperation with competitors, suppliers and buyers. Businesses based in communes with a high SGR were characterized by greater development prospects. We should also confirm the existence of considerable restrictions to the growth of enterprises in local systems in peripheral regions, limiting the scope for the territorial expansion of their business.
3. An overall assessment of entrepreneurs' involvement in interactions with business entities in the same commune in proportion to their participation in interactions with business entities outside of the same commune suggests relatively large involvement of the respondents in interactions with buyers in the same commune, average involvement in interactions with suppliers and slightly lower involvement in interactions with competitors.

4. The communes analysed in this study display potential for cooperation within the same industry or related industries. This type of cooperation is maintained by 1/3 entrepreneurs, who reported above-average intensity of interactions. This phenomenon should be viewed as positive from the perspective of local economies. In this context, finding ways to raise integration levels by implementing relevant local government policies may be a challenge.
5. Entrepreneurs participated in creating local (commune-level) supply chains while reporting connections with suppliers outside of local systems. These interactions were highly individual, which supported strengthening their competitive position.
6. Businesses analysed in this study played a key role in enhancing the diversity of local (commune-level) goods and services markets while taking into account their customers' requirements.
7. For a substantial number of entrepreneurs (both in high and low-SGR communes), maintaining cooperation on a local level was associated with a number of benefits such as decreased operational risk, shorter undertaking completion times and increased customer satisfaction. To a lesser extent, the benefits involved tangible results such as cheaper supply sources or cost reduction. Obtaining a broader range of benefits co-existed with relatively better conditions for smart growth potential. Such conditions were conducive to e.g. efforts aimed at boosting the innovativeness of the businesses. One may assume that local cooperation promoted strengthening of the competitive edge of cooperating businesses, becoming a local resilience factor.
8. The characteristics of cooperative links presented in the study revealed that the benefits of local cooperation were appreciated more often in the group of businesses with inferior conditions for smart growth potential. This finding may imply that those businesses adopted a cooperative strategy in the face of generally more challenging conditions for running and growing a business.
9. Local economic growth policies in peripheral regions should take into account the assumptions arising from the *smart village* concept. They should be based on an in-depth diagnosis of the conditions for local smart growth potential and contain detailed references to the directions and tools for the development of local economic and social innovations. A vital component of these policies in the context of fostering local innovativeness is the focus on the possibility of stimulating cooperation processes within local business sectors. Such focus of local policies may be seen as aimed at enhancing the resilience of local socio-economic systems.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Adamowicz Mieczysław. 2021. The potential for innovative and smart rural development in the peripheral regions of Eastern Poland. *Agriculture* 11 (3): 188. DOI: 10.3390/agriculture11030188.
- Adamowicz Mieczysław, Magdalena Zwolińska-Ligaj. 2009. Koncepcja wielofunkcyjności jako element zrównoważonego rozwoju obszarów wiejskich (The concept of multifunctionality as an element of sustainable development of rural areas). *Zeszyty Naukowe SGGW w Warszawie. Polityki Europejskie, Finanse i Marketing* 2 (51): 11-38.
- Atterton Jane. 2007. The „strength of weak ties”: social networking by business owners in the Highlands and Islands of Scotland. *Sociologia Ruralis* 47 (3): 228-245. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2007.00435.x.
- Camagni Roberto, Roberta Capello. 2013. Regional competitiveness and territorial capital: A conceptual approach and empirical evidence from the European Union. *Regional Studies* 47 (9): 1383-1402. DOI: 10.1080/00343404.2012.681640.
- Churski Paweł. 2018. Podejście zorientowane terytorialnie (place-based policy) – teoria i praktyka polityki regionalnej (Place-based approach – theory and practice of a regional policy). *Rozwój Regionalny i Polityka Regionalna* 41: 31-50. DOI: 10.14746/rrpr.2018.41.04.
- Courtney Paul, Denis Lépicier, Bertrand Schmitt. 2005. *Rural firms and the local economy – A focus on small and medium-sized towns*. [In] 45th Congress of the European Regional Science Association “Land use and water management in a sustainable network society”, 23-27 August 2005. Amsterdam, The Netherlands.
- Fielke Simon, William Kaye-Blake, Willie Smith, Ronaldo Vibart. 2017. *Operationalising rural community resilience: Framing indicators for measurement*. Report for Resilient Rural Communities Programme, <https://www.agresearch.co.nz/assets/document-library/Operationalising-rural-community-resilience-Framing-indicators-for-measurement.pdf>, access: 10.12.2022.
- GUS (Central Statistical Office). 2020. *Obszary wiejskie w Polsce w 2018 r. Analizy statystyczne* (Rural areas in Poland in 2018. Statistical analyses). Warszawa, Olsztyn: GUS.
- Guzal-Dec Danuta. 2018. Intelligent development of the countryside – the concept of smart villages: assumptions, possibilities and implementation limitations. *Economic and Regional Studies* 11 (30): 32-49. DOI: 10.2478/ers-2018-0023.
- Iacobucci Donato, Francesco Perugini. 2021. Entrepreneurial ecosystems and economic resilience at local level. *Entrepreneurship & Regional Development* 33 (9-10): 689-716. DOI: 10.1080/08985626.2021.1888318.
- King Robert P., Michael S. Hand, Miguel I. Gómez. 2015. *Growing local: Case studies on local food supply chains*. University of Nebraska Press.

- Lapuh Lucija. 2018. Socio-economic characteristics of resilient localities – experiences from Slovenia. *Regional Studies, Regional Science* 5 (1): 149-156. DOI: 10.1080/21681376.2018.1459202.
- Lichtarski Jan. 2003. Współpraca przedsiębiorstwa z innymi podmiotami gospodarczymi. Istota współpracy. [W] *Podstawy nauki o przedsiębiorstwie* (Cooperation of the company with other business entities. The essence of cooperation. [In] Basics of enterprise science), ed. J. Lichtarski, 384-419. Wydawnictwo Akademii Ekonomicznej im. O. Langego we Wrocławiu, Wrocław.
- Martin Ron, Ben Gardiner, Andy Pike, Peter Sunley, Peter Tyler. 2021. 4. Economic shocks and the differential resilience of places. *Regional Studies Policy Impact Books* 3 (2): 73-85. DOI: 10.1080/2578711X.2021.1992170.
- Martin Ron, Peter Sunley. 2015. On the notion of regional economic resilience: conceptualization and explanation. *Journal of Economic Geography* 15 (1): 1-42. DOI: 10.1093/jeg/lbu015.
- Murdoch Jonathan. 2000. Networks – a new paradigm of rural development? *Journal of Rural Studies* 16 (4): 407-419. DOI: 10.1016/S0743-0167(00)00022-X.
- Nauwelaers Claire, René Wintjes. 2002. Innovating SMEs and regions: the need for policy intelligence and interactive policies. *Technology Analysis & Strategic Management* 14 (2): 201-215. DOI: 10.1080/09537320220133866.
- Pérez-delHoyo Raquel, Higinio Mora. 2019. Toward a new sustainable development model for Smart Villages. [In] *Smart Villages in the EU and beyond (Emerald studies in politics and technology)*, eds. A. Visvizi, M.D. Lytras, G. Mudri, 49-62. Emerald Publishing Limited, Bingley. DOI: 10.1108/978-1-78769-845-120191005.
- Quaranta Giovanni, Rosanna Salvia. 2014. An index to measure rural diversity in the light of rural resilience and rural development debate. *European Countryside* 6 (2): 161-178. DOI: 10.2478/euco-2014-0009.
- Roundy Philip T., Beverly B. Brockman, Mike Bradshaw. 2017. The resilience of entrepreneurial ecosystems. *Journal of Business Venturing Insights* 8: 99-104. DOI: 10.1016/j.jbvi.2017.08.002.
- Scott Mark. 2013. Resilience: a conceptual lens for rural studies? *Geography Compass* 7 (9): 597-610. DOI: 10.1111/gec3.12066.
- Shearmur Richard, David Doloreux. 2022. Innovation, scaling-up, and local development in peripheral regions: do establishments scale-up locally? *ZFW – Advances in Economic Geography* 66 (4): 185-200. DOI: 10.1515/zfw-2022-0028.
- Slee Bill. 2019. Delivering on the concept of smart villages – in search of an enabling theory. *European Countryside* 11 (4): 634-650. DOI: 10.2478/euco-2019-0035.
- Sokołowicz Mariusz E. 2015. *Rozwój terytorialny w świetle dorobku ekonomii instytucjonalnej. Przestrzeń – bliskość – instytucje* (Territorial development in the light of the achievements of institutional economics. Space – proximity – institutions). Łódź: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Łódzkiego.

- Steiner Artur, Jane Atterton. 2015. Exploring the contribution of rural enterprises to local resilience. *Journal of Rural Studies* 40: 30-45. DOI: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.05.004.
- Stimson Robert, Roger Stough, Peter Nijkamp. 2011. Endogenous regional development. [In] *Endogenous regional development: perspectives, measurement and empirical investigation*, eds. R. Stimson, R. Stough, P. Nijkamp, 1-19. Edward Elgar Publishing.
- Stojanova Simona, Gianluca Lentini, Peter Niederer, Thomas Egger, Nina Cvar, Andrej Kos, and Emilija Stojmenova Duh. 2021. Smart Villages policies: past, present and future. *Sustainability* 13 (4): 1663. DOI: 10.3390/su13041663.
- Terluin Ida J. 2003. Differences in economic development in rural regions of advanced countries: an overview and critical analysis of theories. *Journal of Rural Studies* 19 (3): 327-344. DOI: 10.1016/S0743-0167(02)00071-2.
- Van der Ploeg Jan D., Terry Marsden. 2008. *Unfolding Webs: the dynamics of regional rural development*. Assen: Royal Van Gorcum, <https://edepot.wur.nl/358298>.
- Vlasov Maxim, Karl Johan Bonnedahl, Zsuzsanna Vincze. 2018. Entrepreneurship for resilience: Embeddedness in place and in trans-local grassroots networks. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy* 12 (3): 374-394.
- Young Nathan. 2010. Business networks, collaboration and embeddedness in local and extra-local spaces: the case of port Hardy, Canada. *Sociologia Ruralis* 50 (4): 392-408. DOI: 10.1111/j.1467-9523.2010.00521.x.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena. 2007. Funkcje przedsiębiorstw w środowisku lokalnym na przykładzie wybranych gmin województwa lubelskiego. [W] *Społeczno-ekonomiczne aspekty rozwoju polskiej wsi* (Functions of enterprises in the local environment on the example of selected communes of the Lubelskie Voivodeship. [In] *Socio-economic aspects of rural development in Poland*), eds. M. Bład, D. Klepacka-Kolodziejska, 53-63. Warszawa: IRWiR. PAN.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena. 2015. Corporate social responsibility of bioeconomy in the natural valuable areas of the Lubelskie Voivodeship. *Economic and Regional Studies* 8 (1): 92-111.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena. 2018. *Kształtowanie lokalnych systemów innowacji jako sposób realizacji koncepcji inteligentnego rozwoju na przykładzie regionów peryferyjnych* (Shaping local innovation systems as a way of implementing the concept of intelligent development on the example of peripheral regions). Biała Podlaska: Wydawnictwo Państwowej Szkoły Wyższej im. Papieża Jana Pawła II w Białej Podlaskiej.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena, Danuta Guzal-Dec, Mieczysław Adamowicz. 2018. Koncepcja inteligentnego rozwoju lokalnych jednostek terytorialnych na obszarach wiejskich regionu peryferyjnego na przykładzie województwa lubelskiego (The concept of smart development of local territorial units in peripheral rural areas. The case of Lublin Voivodeship). *Więś i Rolnictwo* 2 (179): 247-280. DOI: 10.7366/wir022018/13.
- Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena Anna. 2021. Possibilities of implementing the smart development concept in rural areas from a business perspective. The example of Eastern Poland. *Annals of the Polish Association of Agricultural and Agrobusiness Economists* 23 (1): 97-109. DOI: 10.5604/01.3001.0014.7868.



\*\*\*

POWIĄZANIA KOOPERACYJNE PRZEDSIĘBIORSTW  
W KONTEKŚCIE REZYLIENCJI UKŁADÓW LOKALNYCH.  
STUDIUM PRZYPADKU REGIONÓW PERYFERYJNYCH POLSKI

Słowa kluczowe: rezyliencja lokalna, *smart village*, innowacyjność, przedsiębiorczość, region peryferyjny

ABSTRAKT. Celem pracy jest określenie stopnia i charakteru powiązań kooperacyjnych, charakteryzujących przedsiębiorstwa badanych gmin regionów peryferyjnych, w kontekście wpływu powiązań kooperacyjnych na wzmocnienie rezyliencji gospodarki lokalnej. Badania empiryczne zrealizowano w Polsce, w trzech regionach peryferyjnych na próbie 240 przedsiębiorców. Badane przedsiębiorstwa uczestniczą w budowaniu lokalnych łańcuchów dostaw, jednocześnie wykazując powiązania z dostawcami spoza układów lokalnych. Wypełniają ważną rolę wzbogacania różnorodności lokalnych (gminnych) rynków dóbr i usług, przy jednoczesnym uwzględnianiu wymagań odbiorców. Kooperacja w skali lokalnej służyła wzmocnieniu pozycji konkurencyjnej przedsiębiorstw w niej uczestniczących, stając się czynnikiem lokalnej rezyliencji. Ujawniona charakterystyka powiązań kooperacyjnych wskazuje na przyjmowanie przez przedsiębiorstwa strategii kooperacji w obliczu trudniejszych warunków funkcjonowania i rozwoju. Lokalne polityki rozwoju gospodarczego w regionach peryferyjnych powinny uwzględniać założenia wynikające z koncepcji *smart village*. Istotnym elementem tych polityk, w kontekście wzmocnienia lokalnej innowacyjności, jest zwrócenie uwagi na możliwości pobudzania procesów kooperacji w ramach lokalnych sektorów biznesu. Takie ukierunkowanie lokalnych polityk można postrzegać, jako zmierzające w stronę wzmocnienia stanu rezyliencji lokalnych układów społeczno-ekonomicznych.

## AUTHORS

MAGDALENA ANNA ZWOLIŃSKA-LIGAJ, PHD ENG.

ORCID: 0000-0001-6770-7092

John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Białą Podlaska

Faculty of Economics Sciences

e-mail: m.zwolinska-ligaj@dyd.akademiabialska.pl

DANUTA JOLANTA GUZAL-DEC, DR HAB. PROF. ABNS in Białą Podlaska

ORCID: 0000-0002-2143-1649

John Paul II University of Applied Sciences in Białą Podlaska

Faculty of Economics Sciences

e-mail: d.guzal-dec@dydaktyka.pswbp.pl

---

Proposed citation of the article:

Zwolińska-Ligaj Magdalena Anna, Danuta Jolanta Guzal-Dec. 2023. Cooperative links between businesses in the context of local system resilience. A case study of Poland's peripheral regions. *Annals PAAAE* XXV (1): 325-340.